

## General Disclaimer

### One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.
- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.
- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.
- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.
- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.





# UPDATE TO THE OBJECTIVE LIGHTNING PROBABILITY FORECAST TOOL IN USE AT CAPE CANAVERAL AIR FORCE STATION, FLORIDA



Winfred Lambert  
ENSCO, Inc. / Applied Meteorology Unit  
lambert.winnie@ensco.com

William Roeder  
USAF 45th Weather Squadron  
william.roeder@patrick.af.mil

## BACKGROUND

The 45th Weather Squadron (45 WS) forecasters at Cape Canaveral Air Force Station (CCAFS) include the probability of lightning occurrence in their 24-Hour and Weekly Planning Forecasts, briefed daily at 0700 EDT (1100 UTC). This forecast is used to plan for daily operations at Kennedy Space Center (KSC) and CCAFS.

Prior to development of the Objective Lightning Probability tool, this forecast was based on a subjective analysis of model and observational data, and output from the Neumann-Pfeffer Thunderstorm Index (NPTI; Neumann 1971), an algorithm developed specifically for KSC/CCAFS. However, several studies showed that one-day persistence outperformed the NPTI by ~10%.

The 45 WS forecasters required increased reliability and objectivity in the lightning probability forecast and requested that the Applied Meteorology Unit (AMU) build a tool that would meet those needs. Such a tool was developed by the AMU in Phase I of this work (Lambert and Wheeler, 2005). This poster describes results from Phase II in which the tool was updated to increase its skill, accuracy, and reliability (Lambert 2007).

## PHASE I SUMMARY

The AMU developed five equations, one for each warm season month May–September, using data from the 15-year period 1989–2003. These equations output the probability of lightning occurrence for the day using data available to the forecasters prior to the 0700 EDT weather briefing. The Phase I equations showed

- An ability to distinguish between lightning/non-lightning days,
- Good reliability, accuracy, and skill,
- 31–53% improvement over persistence, and
- **48% improvement over NPTI**

Because of their good performance, they were transitioned to operations in the form of a user-friendly graphical user interface (GUI).

## PHASE II GOALS:

The Phase II work had two goals. The first was to modify the data set and determine if it would improve equation performance. These modifications were to

- Increase the period of record (POR) from 15 to 17 years (1989–2005),
- Change the valid area for lightning occurrence, and
- Try new formulations for three important Phase I predictors:
  - Test new smoothing parameters for the daily climatological probability,
  - Use the CCAFS 1000 UTC sounding to help determine the flow regime, and
  - Determine the mean RH layer most correlated to lightning occurrence.

The second goal was to create a GUI on the 45 WS operational weather display system. The Phase I GUI required forecasters to input data manually. This used critical time needed to forecast other parameters and increased the likelihood of entering an incorrect value.

## DATA SOURCES (PHASE I and II)

### Cloud-to-Ground Lightning Surveillance System (CGLSS)

CGLSS is a network of six sensors surrounding the KSC/CCAFS area that provide

- Date and time,
- Latitude and longitude, and
- Strength and polarity of CG strikes.

These data were used to determine lightning occurrence for each day. Only one CG was required.



### 1200 UTC soundings at Miami, Tampa, and Jacksonville

Following Lerico et al. (2002), the mean wind directions in the 1000–700 mb layers at these stations were used to determine the flow regime for each day.

### 1000 UTC CCAFS sounding

Eleven parameters from this sounding were used as candidate predictors. The mean wind in the 1000–700 mb layer was used to determine the flow regime in Phase II.




## PHASE II: PREDICTOR MODIFICATIONS


### New Valid Area for Lightning Occurrence

The forecasts are for areas within 5 n mi radius circles on KSC/CCAFS (blue and red circles). In Phase I, the valid area for lightning occurrence was a rectangle around all circles.

The 45 WS requested the valid area include only the circles on KSC/CCAFS. If the distance between a CG strike and the center of any circle was  $\leq 5$  n mi, that strike was considered to be in the valid area.



### Change Gaussian Smoother Parameters for Daily Climatology



The daily climatology is the number of lightning days for each date divided by the number of POR years.

A Gaussian smoother was used to eliminate the noise:

- Phase I:  $\pm 7$  days, scale factor = 3 days.
- Phase II:  $\pm 14$ -day scale factor = 7 days.

The 14-day curve is likely more representative of a long-term daily climatology.

### Flow Regime Discriminator

Lerico et al. (2002) defined six distinct flow regimes. In Phase I, a flow regime was not defined on 44% of the days in the POR.

The 1000 UTC CCAFS sounding was used to determine the flow regime for these days, reducing the number of days in 'Other' and 'Missing' by 70%.

Flow Regime	# of Days in POR	Lightning Prob (%)
SW-1: Ridge S of MFL	301	62
SW-2: Ridge between MFL and TBW	256	66
SE-1: Ridge between TBW and JAN	318	51
SE-2: Ridge N of JAN	248	26
NW: Northwest flow over FL	100	43
NE: Northeast flow over FL	114	18
Other: Unclassified regime	1077	24
Missing	187	58



### Optimal RH Layer in 1000 UTC CCAFS Sounding

The mean 800–600 mb layer RH was a predictor in NPTI and in following studies with no rigorous attempts to test other layers.

An iterative technique was used to find the mean RH layer that most correlated with lightning by calculating:

- The mean RH for layers in 25-mb increments between 950–450mb, then
- Their correlation to lightning occurrence.

The optimal layer was found to be 825–525 mb.

## PHASE II: STATISTICS

The data were stratified into 14-year development and 3-year verification data sets. For each warm season day, three random years were chosen, i.e. the verification set contained


1 May 1999/1989/2001, 2 May 1993/2000/1998, ..., 30 September 1991/1993/2002

The remaining years became the development data set. This method reduced the likelihood that any unusual convective seasons would bias the results.

Logistic regression was used because

- It always outputs values between 0 and 1,
- And allows for non-linear changes in probability as predictor values exceed a threshold.

$$y = \frac{e^{(b_0 + b_1x_1 + \dots + b_nx_n)}}{1 + e^{(b_0 + b_1x_1 + \dots + b_nx_n)}}$$



14 candidate predictors used for equation development, all readily available to the 45 WS forecasters.

Final predictors chosen for each equation were those that reduced the residual deviance by  $\geq 0.5\%$ .


The five equations each had 4 to 5 predictors.

## PHASE II: PERFORMANCE

### Brier Skill Score

Measures equation performance against other forecast methods in terms of percent improvement or degradation.

The Phase II equations outperformed Phase I by 8% for the full warm season.



### Reliability

Shows the degree of over- or under-forecasting at discrete forecast probability values.

Phase I and II equations tend to under-forecast lightning; e.g., when the forecast was 20%, lightning occurred 30% of the time.

Overall: Phase I bias = -5.9%; Phase II bias = -0.4%. Phase II equations reduced the bias by over 5%.


Phase II Performance Improvement in %						
Method	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	All
Persistence	28	41	37	47	41	40
Daily Climo	23	25	24	24	26	25
Monthly Climo	29	27	34	30	25	29
Flow Regime	16	12	11	18	18	15
Phase-I Egn	0.2	5	19	-0.8	12	8

### Lightning / Non-Lightning Day Distributions

Distributions of forecast probabilities for lightning and non-lightning days show how the equations distinguish between them.

The two equation sets had similar performance for non-lightning days.

The Phase II equations distinguished lightning days better than Phase I.



## AUTOMATION


The Phase II equations were transitioned into 45 WS operations in May 2007.

They were made available through a GUI on the Meteorological Interactive Data Display System (MIDDS).

The GUI automatically accesses the date and appropriate sounding parameters for each equation from the 1000 UTC CCAFS sounding.

Forecasters choose 'Yes' or 'No' for persistence and a flow regime for the day.

The MIDDS GUI (right) is similar in form and function to the Phase I GUI, which made the transition easier for the forecasters.



## FUTURE WORK: PHASE III

The work in Phase III is driven by the daily climatology curve and has three parts:

- Add October data to capture the spin-down in lightning days at the end of the season,
- Calculate a new 14-day smoothed daily climatology, and then
- Create equations for the progression of the daily climatology instead of each month:

## REFERENCES

- Lambert, W., 2007: Objective lightning probability forecasting for Kennedy Space Center and Cape Canaveral Air Force Station, Phase II. NASA Contractor Report CR-2007-214732, Kennedy Space Center, FL, 59 pp. [Available from ENSCO, Inc., 1980 N. Atlantic Ave., Suite 230, Cocoa Beach, FL, 32931, and at <http://science.ksc.nasa.gov/amu/final.html>].
- Lambert, W. and M. Wheeler, 2005: Objective lightning probability forecasting for Kennedy Space Center and Cape Canaveral Air Force Station. NASA Contractor Report CR-2005-212564, Kennedy Space Center, FL, 54 pp. [Available from ENSCO, Inc., 1980 N. Atlantic Ave., Suite 230, Cocoa Beach, FL, 32931, and at <http://science.ksc.nasa.gov/amu/final.html>].
- Lerico, T., H. Fuelberg, A. Watson, and R. Holle, 2002: Warm season lightning distributions over the Florida Peninsula as related to synoptic patterns. *Wea. Forecasting*, 17, 83–98.
- Neumann, C. J., 1971: Thunderstorm forecasting at Cape Kennedy, Florida, utilizing multiple regression techniques. NOAA Technical Memorandum NWS SOS-8.



REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<p>The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p> <p><b>PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</b></p>					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 11-05-2007		2. REPORT TYPE Conference Poster		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) May 2006 - May 2007	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE  Update to the Objective Lightning Probability Forecast Tool in use at Cape Canaveral Air Force Station, Florida				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER NNK06MA70C	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)  Winifred Lambert William Roeder				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) ENSCO, Inc. 1980 N. Atlantic Ave Suite 230 Cocoa Beach, FL 32931				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) NASA John F. Kennedy Space Center Code KT-C-H Kennedy Space Center, FL 32899				10. SPONSORING/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSORING/MONITORING REPORT NUMBER	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified, Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT  This conference poster describes the improvement of a set of lightning probability forecast equations that are used by the 45th Weather Squadron forecasters for their daily 1100 UTC (0700 EDT) weather briefing during the warm season months of May-September. This information is used for general scheduling of operations at Cape Canaveral Air Force Station and Kennedy Space Center. Forecasters at the Spaceflight Meteorology Group also make thunderstorm forecasts during Shuttle flight operations. Five modifications were made by the Applied Meteorology Unit: increased the period of record from 15 to 17 years, changed the method of calculating the flow regime of the day, calculated a new optimal layer relative humidity, used a new smoothing technique for the daily climatology, and used a new valid area. The test results indicated that the modified equations showed and increase in skill over the current equations, good reliability, and an ability to distinguish between lightning and non-lightning days.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS  Lightning, Probability forecast, Weather					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			Dr. Francis J. Merceret
U	U	U	UU	2	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) (321) 867-0818